

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIG. 1. These sheets replace the original sheet including Figure 1. FIG 1A is a new sheet of drawings.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet
New Sheet

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-12 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 12 are amended, and claim 4 is cancelled.

PRIORITY

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgement of Applicants' claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) and the indication that all necessary priority documents have been received.

SPECIFICATION

The specification is amended herewith to correct minor informalities. More specifically, paragraph [0007] on page 3 is amended to correct the units of measurement described therein.

The Applicants hereby confirm their willingness to cooperate with the Examiner in the identification and correction of further minor errors within the specification. The Applicants respectfully submit, however, that they are not presently aware of any such errors that would require correction.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seike et al. (US Patent No. 5,418,869 hereinafter "Seike") in view of Dumont et al. (US Patent No. 5,463,706 hereinafter "Dumont"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “...a first POF coupler for inputting the plurality of the optical signals received from the plurality of the light sources into the transparently jacketed plastic optical fiber; the transparently jacketed plastic optical fiber having one end connected to the first POF coupler and the other end connected to a second POF coupler, said second POF coupler being provided for separating the optical signal transmitted from the transparently jacketed plastic optical fiber into a plurality of optical signals...” Further, in the color optical link recited in amended claim 1 “said first and second POF couplers are designed such that a plurality of optical fibers for transmitting the plurality of optical signals are polished and bound into an optical fiber unit so that the optical fibers are uniformly arranged along a circumference of the optical fiber unit, thus inputting and outputting the plurality of optical signals in parallel to and from the transparently jacketed plastic optical fiber;” (Emphasis added).

Seike describes a fixing portion of an optical fiber type wave-divider-multiplexer wherein an optical fiber glass portion is fixed to a fixing member by an adhesive. Seike states “A substantially semicylindrical member is used as fixing member 4, and portions of the optical fiber cladding portions 1a and 1b and glass portions 2a and 2b are fixed by an adhesive 5” FIGS. 5a-5c column 6, lines 8-21.

Applicants respectfully submit that Seike fails to teach or fairly suggest a structure, wherein the portions of the optical fiber cladding portions and glass portions are polished and bound into fixing member. Even if the Examiner cites optical fibers of Seike as inherently polished, Seike does not disclose, teach, or suggest a structure where the optical fibers are arranged along the circumference of the fixing member.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Seike fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the color optical link of amended claim 1 reciting, *inter alia*, “said first and second POF couplers

are designed such that a plurality of optical fibers for transmitting the plurality of optical signals are polished and bound into an optical fiber unit so that the optical fibers are uniformly arranged along a circumference of the optical fiber unit, thus inputting and outputting the plurality of optical signals in parallel to and from the transparently jacketed plastic optical fiber”

Amended independent claim 12 recites features similar to independent claim 1 and therefore similar arguments apply. More specifically, Seike fails to disclose, teach or fairly suggest a method for achieving a color optical link using a transparently jacketed plastic optical fiber comprising of the recited steps.

Dumont fails to cure the deficiencies of Seike. Therefore, the combination of Seike and Dumont would still not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 and 12.

Claims 2-3, 5-8 and 10-11 depend from claim 1 and recite features similar to claim 1. Therefore, the arguments discussed above regarding the deficiencies of Seike with respect to independent claim 1 and the improper combination of Seike and Dumont also apply to claims 2-3, 5-8 and 10-11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Seike in view of Dumont, and further in view of Presby (U.S. Patent No. 4,676,594, herein Presby). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

The Applicants respectfully incorporate the discussion above with respect to the deficiencies of both Seike and Dumont. The Applicants respectfully contend that even were such a combination to be made, the teachings of Presby are not sufficient to remedy the noted deficiencies in Seike and Dumont.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-3 and 5-12 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$120.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By:

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/AZP:let

A2A